

35



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,038	03/16/2001	Aline Fichou	FR919990055US1	5687
42640	7590	12/19/2005		
DILLON & YUDELL LLP 8911 NORTH CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY SUITE 2110 AUSTIN, TX 78759			EXAMINER BLAIR, DOUGLAS B	
			ART UNIT 2142	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/811,038

Applicant(s)

FICHO ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas B. Blair

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 8-23 are currently pending in this application. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 8-14 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,694,429 to Kalmanek, Jr. et al..

4. As to claim 8, Kalmanek teaches a system for reserving a virtual connection from a source workstation to a destination workstation within a network to allow data packets of data are transmitted over a network between an ingress node of said source workstation and an egress node of said destination workstation, said method: sending a setup request message for a virtual connection from said source workstation to a reservation server (col. 6, lines 47-62), wherein said reservation server includes connection setup means for setting up a virtual connection that meets a predefined Quality of Service requirement from said ingress node to said egress node (col. 9, lines 18-34); determining whether or not said setup request request can be validated based on user information within said source workstation, wherein said user information is

Art Unit: 2142

accessible by said reservation server (col. 9, lines 18-34); in response to a determination that said reservation request can be validated based on user information within said source workstation, determining whether or not the capacity of said network is sufficient to meet the requirements of said setup request (col. 10, line 47-col. 11, line 2); and in response to the capacity of said network being sufficient to meet the requirements of said setup request, establishing a virtual connection from said ingress node to said egress node (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 17); however Kalmanek does not explicitly teach a reservation request message sent from the workstation to a reservation server.

Kalmanek does teach a reservation request being sent as part of the setup process for the connection to be established (col. 10, lines 19-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kalmanek regarding accepting a setup message for a connection with the teachings of Kalmanek regarding a reservation request because Kalmanek states that the “quality of service can be determined by the calling party” (col. 9, lines 19-34) making it obvious for the workstation in Kalmanek to explicitly send the reservation request to the reservation server.

5. As to claim 9, Kalmanek teaches a method according to claim 8, wherein said step of verifying that said request may be validated further comprises: verifying the authentication of said user (col. 10, lines 19-32); and verifying the user rights to obtain said virtual connection (col. 10, lines 19-32).

6. As to claim 10, Kalmanek teaches a method according to claim 8, further comprising in response to insufficient capacity of said IP network with respect to a previous reservation

Art Unit: 2142

request, delivering a new reservation request from said source workstation to said reservation server, wherein said new reservation request includes new parameters that are set in accordance with the capacity of said network as reported from said reservation server to said source workstation (col. 10, lines 47-col 11, line 13).

7. As to claim 11, Kalmanek teaches a method according to claim 8, further comprising delivering from said reservation server to said ingress and egress nodes, information required to set up a virtual connection from said ingress node to said egress node and a flow identification of the communication to be established such that said ingress node may transmit any packet received from said source workstation over said connection (col. 9, line 34-col. 10, line 18).

8. As to claim 12, Kalmanek teaches a method according to claim 11, wherein the information sent by said reservation server to said ingress and egress nodes to set up a virtual connection includes a FlowID identifying the flow corresponding to the communication to be established over said virtual connection (col. 9, line 34-col. 10, line 18).

9. As to claim 13, Kalmanek teaches a method according to claim 12, further comprising comparing a FlowID of a new packet received by said ingress node with at least one FlowID corresponding to at least one reserved virtual connection that has been established from said reservation server to said ingress node (col. 28, lines 4-22).

10. As to claim 14, Kalmanek teaches the method according to claim 12, further comprising delivering a RouteID from said reservation server to said ingress and egress nodes, wherein said RouteID identifies a route already known by said nodes (col. 28, lines 4-22).

11. As to claim 16-22, they feature the same limitations as claims 8-14 and are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8-14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claim 15 and 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,694,429 to Kalmanek, Jr. et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,768,738 to Yazaki et al..

14. As to claim 15 and 23, Kalmanek teaches the method according to claim 11 and 20, however Kalmanek does not explicitly teach a packet including a source address, a destination address, a port number, and a QOS identifier.

Yazaki teaches a packet including a source address, a destination address, a port number, and a QOS identifier (col. 2, lines 51-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kalmanek regarding the establishment of a virtual connection with the teachings of Yazaki regarding a packet including a source address, a destination address, a port number, and a QOS identifier because such information would help a router perform QOS controls (Yazaki, col. 2, lines 51-67).

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2142

15. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 7/28/2005, with respect to claim 8 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 102 anticipation rejection based on Kalmanek of claims 8-23 has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is 571-272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Douglas Blair

DBB



**ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**